arXiv:1408.1911v2 [math.CO] 10 Jun 2015

AN ITERATED RESIDUE PERSPECTIVE ON STABLE GROTHENDIECK POLYNOMIALS

JUSTIN ALLMAN AND RICHÁRD RIMÁNYI

Abstract. Grothendieck polynomials are important objects in the study of the K-theory of flag varieties. Their many remarkable properties have been studied in the context of algebraic geometry and tableaux combinatorics. We explore a new tool, similar to generating sequences, which we call the iterated residue technique. We prove multiplication and comultiplication formulas for Grothendieck polynomials in terms iterated residues and other results useful for computations. Moreover, we show the effectiveness of the method with new proofs that the Pieri rule for stable Grothendieck polynomials and their Schur expansions exhibit alternating signs.

Introduction

Grothendieck polynomials, one for each permutation, were introduced by Lascoux and Schützenberger in their seminal work [LS82] as representatives for K-classes of Schubert varieties in flag manifolds. They play the role in K-theory of the Schubert polynomials in cohomology. Stable versions of these polynomials, again corresponding to any permutation, appeared in the works of Fomin and Kirillov [FK94, FK96] and were shown to be supersymmetric via an analogous construction to that of the Stanley symmetric functions. Buch showed that the stable Grothendieck polynomials corresponding to Grassmannian permutations, and therefore to partitions, formed a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear basis for all stable Grothendieck polynomials [Buc02b]. It is these polynomials which are the subject of this paper.

Over the past decade the stable Grothendieck polynomials corresponding to partitions have become important to many problems in the realm of algebraic combinatorics, for example in [Len00, Buc02b], and in particular have appeared in several algebro-geometric contexts:

- as representatives of Schubert varieties in the K-theory of Grassmannians, e.g. in [Bri05, Buc05],
- as the proper basis to describe K-classes of degeneracy loci for Dynkin quivers, e.g. in [All14a, Buc02a, Buc08, Mil05], and
- as a basis for Thom polynomials in K-theory [RS15].

In each of these settings (and more) alternating signs have been proven or at least conjectured to appear in the relevant formulae, see [Bri02, Bri05, Buc02a, Buc02b, Buc08, FL94, Len00, Mil05, RS15] and many more. These results regarding alternating signs appear to depend on an amalgam of geometric techniques e.g. in [Bri02, FL94], inventive combinatorics e.g. in [Buc02b, Buc02a, Buc08, Len00, Mil05], or identities in the theory of symmetric functions e.g. in [FG98, Len00].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E05, 14N15.
Key words and phrases. Grothendieck polynomials, Schur functions, iterated residues.

Recently the second author and Szenes have given a new formula for the stable Grothendieck polynomials in terms of *iterated residues* [RS15] which we now describe. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{N'})$ be sets of variables and $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, z_2, \ldots)$ an ordered set of complex valued indeterminates. For each positive integer p define the meromorphic differential form

$$\kappa_p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta} | \boldsymbol{z}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{\prod_{b \in \boldsymbol{\beta}} (1 - z_i b)}{\prod_{a \in \boldsymbol{\alpha}} (1 - z_i a)} \cdot \frac{d \log(z_i)}{(1 - z_i)^{N - N'}} \right) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \left(1 - \frac{z_j}{z_i} \right).$$

where $d\log(w) = (1/w)dw$ for any indeterminate w. Given an integer sequence $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_p)$, not necessarily a partition, the *double stable Grothendieck polynomial* is given by the *iterated residue* formula

$$G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \operatorname*{Res}_{\boldsymbol{z}=0,\infty} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p} (1 - z_j)^{I_j - j} \, \kappa_p(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta} | \boldsymbol{z}) \right) \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_p)$ and for any rational function f in the variables $\boldsymbol{z}$ we define $\operatorname{Res}_{\boldsymbol{z}=0,\infty}(f(\boldsymbol{z})\, dz)$ to be

$$\left(\operatorname*{Res}_{z_p=0} + \operatorname*{Res}_{z_p=\infty} \right) \circ \cdots \circ \left(\operatorname*{Res}_{z_2=0} + \operatorname*{Res}_{z_2=\infty} \right) \circ \left(\operatorname*{Res}_{z_1=0} + \operatorname*{Res}_{z_1=\infty} \right) (f(\boldsymbol{z})\, dz). \tag{2}$$

Whenever $\beta_j = 1$ for all j, the polynomial $G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is denoted simply by $G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and is called the *single* stable Grothendieck polynomial.

It is remarkable that the iterated residue formulation of $G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ agrees with the definition, originally due to Buch [Buc02a, Corollary 3.3, Equation 3.1] and which we recall in Section 2.4, for stable Grothendieck polynomials corresponding also to *non-partition* integer sequences [RS15]. When I is not a partition we call $G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ a *fake* Grothendieck polynomial. Throughout the sequel, when a statement about stable Grothendieck polynomials holds independently of the variables $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ we will write simply G_I for $G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$.

Using Equation (1), the second author and Szenes have given new results for expansions of K-theoretic Thom polynomials in the basis of Grothendieck polynomials [RS15], and the first author has provided a new method for computing K-classes corresponding to degeneracy loci of Dynkin quivers [All14a, All14b]. In the latter case, a positivity conjecture of Buch has remained open for many years [Buc08].

Several other positivity and stability results from iterated residues have recently appeared. Bérczi and Szenes introduced iterated residues and established the positivity of several Thom polynomials of so-called Morin singularities [BS12]. Kazarian has provided residue formulas for Thom polynomials of contact singularities [Kaz10b, Kaz10a]. Iterated residue formulas for integrating over homogeneous spaces in cohomology are given by Zielenkiewicz [Zie14] and K-theoretic analogues appear, at least in type A for example, in the work of the second author [All14a]. Kaliszewski has given several new results on cohomological quiver loci [Kal13] using an iterated residue formula of the second author [Rim14]. It is our hope that iterated residue techniques will develop to provide a formal tool in attacking open conjectures regarding positivity, especially alternating signs related to Grothendieck polynomials.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 1 we set notation and lay out relevant background material. In Section 2 we show how to multiply and

comultiply Grothendieck polynomials in the language of iterated residue operations, and prove several other results relating various symmetric functions in terms of iterated residues. In Section 3 we use iterated residue methods to show that the stable Grothendieck polynomial analogue of the Pieri rule exhibits alternating signs. Finally, in Section 4 we use residue techniques to show that the Schur expansion of any stable Grothendieck polynomial also exhibits alternating signs. The results of both Sections 3 and 4 are originally due to Lenart [Len00] via combinatorics and, in the case of the former, seperately confirmed by Fulton and Lascoux [FL94] and Brion [Bri02] using geometric methods.

1. Definitions and examples

1.1. **Preliminaries.** A weakly decreasing integer sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_p)$ is called a *partition*. The *length* $\ell(\lambda)$ is the number of nonzero parts and the *weight* $|\lambda|$ is the sum of the parts. Allow $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots)$ and $\boldsymbol{y} = (y_1, y_2, \ldots)$ to denote families of variables; usually we assume that only finitely many of these are non-zero. The Jacobi-Trudi formula [Mac95, Equation I.3.4] defines for every partition λ a *Schur function* according to the determinant

$$s_\lambda = s_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{y}) = \det\left(h_{\lambda_i + j - i}\right)_{1 \leq i,j \leq p}, \tag{3}$$

where the symbols h_r are formally defined by the generating function

$$\sum_{r \geq 0} h_r u^r = \frac{\prod_{y \in \boldsymbol{y}} (1 + yu)}{\prod_{x \in \boldsymbol{x}} (1 - xu)}.$$

If all the $\boldsymbol{y}$ variables are zero, then we write $s_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x})$ for the Schur function and observe that the polynomials h_r are the complete homogeneous symmetric functions of degree r in the variables $\boldsymbol{x}$.

To a partition λ one also associates the stable Grothendieck polynomial $G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ by equation (1). Often in the literature, see for example [LS82, FG98, Buc02b], Grothendieck polynomials are given not in terms of the variables $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, but in terms of variables $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ with $x_i = 1 - \alpha_i^{-1}$ and $y_j = 1 - \beta_j$ for all i and all j. In these variables we will, by abuse of notation, write $G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{y}) = G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta})$ for the double stable Grothendieck polynomial. Analogously, we write $G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) = G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ for the single stable Grothendieck polynomial. In the latter case, observe that $\beta_j = 1$ implies that each $y_j = 0$. Note that $G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{y})$ is indeed a *polynomial* in the variables $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$, see e.g. [Buc02b].

One can see that $G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{y})$ is separately symmetric in $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{y}$ since (1) is separately symmetric in $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and moreover, is non-homogeneous in general. It is well known, that the lowest degree homogeneous term of G_λ is the corresponding Schur polynomial s_λ, see for example [Buc02b]. It is also known that for any partitions λ and μ, there exist unique integers $c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}$, only finitely many of which are non-zero, such that

$$G_\lambda G_\mu = \sum_\nu c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu} G_\nu \tag{4}$$

where the sum is over all partitions ν with $|\nu| \geq |\lambda| + |\mu|$. Buch has given a combinatorial formula for the integers $c^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}$ in terms of counting *set-valued tableaux* [Buc02b].

For general integer sequences $I = (I_1, I_2, \ldots)$ with only finitely many non-zero parts we define the *length* $\ell(I)$ to be the largest integer p for which I_p is non-zero.

Such a sequence is called *finite*. When I is a partition, the two notions of length coincide. The *weight* $|I| = \sum_k I_k$ is also defined for finite sequences. One uses the Jacobi-Trudi formula (3) to define for any finite non-partition integer sequence $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_p)$ a *fake* Schur function

$$s_I = \det\left(h_{I_i+j-i}\right)_{1\leq i,j\leq p}.$$

Now let I and J be any finite integer sequences, a and b any integers, and L a finite integer sequence with only non-positive parts. By interchanging rows in the determinant above, one obtains the following "straightening laws" for Schur functions

$$s_{I,a,b,J} = -s_{I,b-1,a+1,J} \tag{5a}$$

$$s_{I,a,a+1,J} = 0 \tag{5b}$$

$$s_{I,L} = 0. \tag{5c}$$

These relations imply that any (possibly fake) Schur function s_I is either equal to $\pm s_\nu$ for some partition ν or is zero. Analogously Buch has defined stable Grothendieck polynomials G_I for any integer sequence I using a formula of Lenart [Len00, Theorem 2.4] and has proven the following "straightening laws" (see [Buc02a], Section 3)

$$G_{I,a,b,J} = G_{I,a+1,b,J} + G_{I,b,a+1,J} - G_{I,b-1,a+1,J} \tag{6a}$$

$$G_{I,a,a+1,J} = G_{I,a+1,a+1,J} \tag{6b}$$

$$G_{I,L} = G_I. \tag{6c}$$

The stable Grothendieck polynomial straightening relations imply that for any integer sequence I there exist unique integers $\delta_{I,\lambda}$ only finitely many of which are nonzero, such that $G_I = \sum_\lambda \delta_{I,\lambda} G_\lambda$. In contrast to the Schur functions this implies that G_I is *never* zero. Notice that in performing these operations signs can be introduced in a complicated way, i.e. the coefficients $\delta_{I,\lambda}$ do not necessarily alternate with the difference of weights $|\lambda| - |I|$.

Observe that from the iterated residue (1), the stable Grothendieck polynomials for partitions and non-partitions alike are defined by a single formula. Importantly, the laws of Equations (6a), (6b), and (6c) turn out to be simple analytical consequences of Equation (1) [RS15].

1.2. **Symmetric functions and iterated residues.** Let $\boldsymbol{t} = (t_1, t_2, \ldots)$ denote an alphabet of ordered variables. Henceforth, given a finite integer sequence $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_p)$ we denote the monomial $\prod_{j=1}^n t_j^{I_j}$ succinctly by t^I in multi-index notation. Let I denote such a sequence, and define the following operation on monomials in the ring of formal Laurent series $\mathbb{Z}((\boldsymbol{t}))$

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(t^I\right) = G_I.$$

Moreover if $\boldsymbol{a}$ denotes any object on which a stable Grothendieck polynomial can be evaluated, for example the variables $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ of Equation (1), then define

$$\mathcal{G}^{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(t^I\right) = G_I(\boldsymbol{a}).$$

We will also refer to the $\mathcal{G}^\bullet_\bullet$ operation as an *iterated residue operation*. Such formulae sometimes appear in the literature with the title *constant term operations*. We justify this terminology in Remark 2.11, but for more details consult the sources [Kal13, Rim14, All14b]. Extend these operations linearly to the $\mathbb{Z}$-submodule of

$\mathbb{Z}((\boldsymbol{t}))$ for which the result is a *finite* $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of stable Grothendieck polynomials. Furthermore, we allow $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ to act on rational functions in $\mathbb{Z}(\boldsymbol{t})$ provided they have a formal Laurent expansion. By convention, we will always operate on the domain $t_i < t_j$ for $i < j$ when computing such expansions. Whenever two rational functions $f_1(\boldsymbol{t})$ and $f_2(\boldsymbol{t})$ have the property that $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}(f_1(\boldsymbol{t})) = \mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}(f_2(\boldsymbol{t}))$ we say that f_1 is $\mathcal{G}$-*equivalent* to f_2 and write $f_1 \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} f_2$.

Now by analogy to the definitions above we can define another *iterated residue operation* $\mathcal{S}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$ as follows. Set

$$\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(t^I\right) = s_I$$

where s_I denotes the (possibly fake) Schur function for the integer sequence I. Moreover if $\boldsymbol{a}$ is any object on which a Schur function can be evaluated then we also define

$$\mathcal{S}^{\boldsymbol{a}}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(t^I\right) = s_I(\boldsymbol{a}).$$

Analogously to the $\mathcal{G}$-operation, extend the $\mathcal{S}$-operation to $\mathbb{Z}(\boldsymbol{t})$. If the rational functions $f_1(\boldsymbol{t})$ and $f_2(\boldsymbol{t})$ have the property that $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}(f_1(\boldsymbol{t})) = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}(f_2(\boldsymbol{t}))$ then we say they are $\mathcal{S}$-*equivalent* and write $f_1 \overset{\mathcal{S}}{\sim} f_2$. For more details on the property of $\mathcal{S}$-equivalence, we refer the reader to the thesis of Kaliszewski [Kal13].

2. Calculus of iterated residues

If $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_p)$ and $J = (J_1, \ldots, J_q)$ are finite integer sequences one can form the new sequence $I, J = (I_1, \ldots, I_p, J_1, \ldots, J_q)$ and if $p = q$, also form the sequence $I + J = (I_1 + J_1, \ldots, I_p + J_p)$. These notations will appear throughout.

2.1. **Multiplication via iterated residues.** In the sequel, it will be convenient to define the factors

$$d_i = 1 - t_i \qquad\qquad d_{i,j} = 1 - t_i t_j^{-1}.$$

and the *multiplication kernel* given by the rational function

$$K_{p,q}(\boldsymbol{t}) = \prod_{i=1}^{p} \frac{d_i^q}{\prod_{j=1}^{q} d_{i,p+j}}.$$

Theorem 2.1. *The product $G_I \times G_J$ is given by the formula*

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(t^{I,J} K_{p,q}(\boldsymbol{t})\right).$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the result for the product $G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta}) \times G_J(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta})$ where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_N)$ for some very large N. Let $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_p)$ and $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_q)$ be sets of complex-valued indeterminates. Define $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ where $n = p + q$ by $z_i = \xi_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $z_{p+j} = \zeta_j$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, q\}$.

For any collection of complex valued indeterminates $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_r)$ and any integer sequence $L = (L_1, \ldots, L_r)$ it is useful to define the products

$$\mathcal{M}_L(\boldsymbol{w}) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} (1 - w_i)^{L_i - i}$$

$$\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{w}) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{N}(1 - w_i\beta_j)}{\prod_{k=1}^{N}(1 - w_i\alpha_k)}$$

$$\delta(\boldsymbol{w}) = \prod_{1 \le i < j \le r} \left(1 - \frac{w_j}{w_i}\right).$$

Therefore, in this case, we have that

$$\kappa_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta}|\boldsymbol{w}) = \mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{w})\delta(\boldsymbol{w})\prod_{i=1}^{r} d\log(w_i).$$

We can then represent the desired product of Grothendieck polynomials $G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta})\times G_J(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta})$ as the iterated residue

$$\operatorname*{Res}_{\boldsymbol{z}=0,\infty}\left(\mathcal{M}_I(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathcal{M}_J(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\delta(\boldsymbol{\xi})\delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\prod_{i=1}^{n} d\log(z_i)\right).$$

We now wish to convert the expression above entirely into the variables $\boldsymbol{z}$. First, notice that $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) = \mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{z})$ and

$$\delta(\boldsymbol{\xi})\delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{\zeta_j}{\xi_i}\right) = \delta(\boldsymbol{z}). \tag{7}$$

Moreover, for every i and j we have the identity

$$1-\frac{\zeta_j}{\xi_i} = \frac{1}{\xi_i}\left[(1-\zeta_j)-(1-\xi_i)\right] = \frac{1-\zeta_j}{\xi_i}\left[1-\frac{(1-\xi_i)}{(1-\zeta_j)}\right].$$

Combining this observation with the identity of Equation (7), we obtain that $\mathcal{M}_I(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathcal{M}_J(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\delta(\boldsymbol{\xi})\delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ equals

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{M}_I(\boldsymbol{\xi})\mathcal{M}_J(\boldsymbol{\zeta})}{\prod_{j=1}^{q}(1-\zeta_j)^p}\right)\left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{p}\xi_i^q}{\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{(1-\xi_i)}{(1-\zeta_j)}\right)}\right)\delta(\boldsymbol{\xi})\delta(\boldsymbol{\zeta})\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{\zeta_j}{\xi_i}\right)$$

which in the $\boldsymbol{z}$ variables becomes the expression

$$\mathcal{M}_{I,J}(\boldsymbol{z})\left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{p} z_i^q}{\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{(1-z_i)}{(1-z_{p+j})}\right)}\right)\delta(\boldsymbol{z}).$$

The analysis above implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &G_I(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta})\times G_J(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta}) \\ &= \operatorname*{Res}_{\boldsymbol{z}=0,\infty}\left(\mathcal{M}_{I,J}(\boldsymbol{z})\left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{p} z_i^q}{\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{(1-z_i)}{(1-z_{p+j})}\right)}\right)\kappa_n(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\boldsymbol{\beta}|\boldsymbol{z})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to interpret the desired product as a sum of Grothendieck polynomials, the rational function

$$\mathcal{M}_{I,J}(\boldsymbol{z})\left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{p} z_i^q}{\prod_{i=1}^{p}\prod_{j=1}^{q}\left(1-\frac{(1-z_i)}{(1-z_{p+j})}\right)}\right)$$

needs to be expanded as a Laurent series about $z_i = 1$ for each i. The order of residues prescribed by equation (2) implies we should do this on the domain $z_j < z_i$ for $i < j$. Finally, translating to the $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ operation and making the substitution $z_i = 1 - t_i$ for all i yields the result. □

2.2. **Computational lemmas.** We now prove two lemmas which we will find useful for manipulating rational functions inside the $\mathcal{G}^{\bullet}_{\bullet}$ operation.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f(\boldsymbol{t})$ be a rational function independent of both t_i and t_{i+1}. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ one has the following "straightening law".*

$$f \cdot t_i^a t_{i+1}^b d_i \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} -f \cdot t_i^{b-1} t_{i+1}^{a+1} d_i. \tag{8}$$

In particular, if $b = a+1$ then the expressions on both sides are $\mathcal{G}$-equivalent to zero.

Proof. The numbered equation (8) is just an encoding of the relation (6a) in the language of the $\mathcal{G}$-operation. Similarly, the case $b = a+1$ encodes equation (6b). □

Lemma 2.3. *Let $F(t_1, \ldots, t_{r-1}, t_r)$ be a rational function in $\mathbb{Z}(\boldsymbol{t})$. In particular, F is independent of t_i for $i > r$. Suppose that no positive power of t_r appears in its Laurent expansion about zero. Then*

$$F(t_1, \ldots, t_{r-1}, t_r) \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} F(t_1, \ldots, t_{r-1}, 1).$$

Proof. This is the iterated residue version of (6c). □

Example 2.4. Theorem 2.1 implies that $G_1 \times G_1$ is equal to applying the $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$-operation to the rational function

$$t_1^1 t_2^1 \left(\frac{1 - t_1}{1 - t_1 t_2^{-1}} \right),$$

which can be rewritten as

$$t_1 t_2 (1 - t_1) \left(1 + \frac{\frac{t_1}{t_2}}{1 - \frac{t_1}{t_2}} \right) = t_1 t_2 (1 - t_1) + t_1^2 \frac{1 - t_1}{1 - \frac{t_1}{t_2}}$$

where the second term has only non-positive powers of t_2. By Lemma 2.3 the expression above is $\mathcal{G}$-equivalent to the polynomial

$$t_1 t_2 (1 - t_1) + t_1^2 = t_1^1 t_2^1 + t_1^2 - t_1^2 t_2^1,$$

and so $G_1 \times G_1 = G_{1,1} + G_2 - G_{2,1}$. ◊

2.3. **Comultiplication via iterated residues.** Set $\Gamma = \bigoplus_\lambda \mathbb{Z} G_\lambda$ where the sum is taken over all partitions λ. We remark that, for example, the analysis of Section 2.1 endows Γ with the structure of a commutative algebra with unity. It is known that Γ is moreover a commutative, cocommutative bialgebra; that is, a cocummutative comultiplication $\Delta : \Gamma \to \Gamma \otimes \Gamma$ of stable Grothendieck polynomials is also defined (see for example [Buc02b] and [Buc05]). Explicitly, for each partition ν there exist unique integers $d^\nu_{\lambda,\mu}$ such that

$$\Delta(G_\nu) = \sum_{\lambda,\mu} d^\nu_{\lambda,\mu} G_\lambda \otimes G_\mu$$

where the sum is over all pairs of partitions $\lambda, \mu \subseteq \nu$ and has the property that $(-1)^{|\nu|-|\lambda|-|\mu|} d^\nu_{\lambda,\mu} \geq 0$ for all triples of partitions λ, μ, and ν.

Remark 2.5. The comultiplication map is determined combinatorially from the multiplication map, cf. [Buc05, Example 5] by the following process. For each partition ν choose a rectangular partition R containing ν and form the product $G_\nu G_R = \sum_\tau c^\tau_{\nu R} G_\tau$. It is not difficult to observe that for each τ in the expansion,

the skew diagram τ/R has the form $\lambda * \mu$ for some λ and μ and it follows that $c^{\tau}_{\nu R} = d^{\nu}_{\lambda\mu}$. $\Diamond$

We can use this fact to give an iterated residue expression for the image under the comultiplication map of G_I for any integer sequence I, not necessarily a partition. First extend the meaning of the symbol $\mathcal{G}_{\bullet}$ as follows. Let $\boldsymbol{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots)$ be a family of ordered variables disjoint from the family $\boldsymbol{t}$. Let I and J denote any finite integer sequences and define

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{s}}(t^I s^J) = G_I \otimes G_J \in \Gamma \otimes \Gamma. \tag{9}$$

Analogously to the operation $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ extend this operation linearly to $\mathbb{Z}(\boldsymbol{t}, \boldsymbol{s})$. With these conventions, we have

Theorem 2.6. *For any finite integer sequence I of length n, the element $\Delta(G_I) \in \Gamma \otimes \Gamma$ is given by*

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{s}} \left(t^I \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(1-s_i)^n}{\prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 - s_i t_j^{-1})} \right) \tag{10}$$

Proof. Set $m = \max(I)$. If this number is non-positive, then $G_I = G_{\emptyset} = 1 \in \Gamma$. In this case each variable t_j occurs only with non-positive exponents. Hence by Lemma 2.3 the expression in (10) is equivalent under $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t},\boldsymbol{s}}$ to the one obtained by specializing $t_j = 1$ for all j. Again because $G_I = 1$, the result is the element $1 \otimes 1 \in \Gamma \otimes \Gamma$ as desired.

If $m > 0$ write $G_I = \sum_{\lambda} \delta_{I,\lambda} G_{\lambda}$ where the sum is over all partitions λ and the integers $\delta_{I,\lambda}$ are determined uniquely by the straitening laws of (6a), (6b), and (6c). Consider the rectangular partition $R = (m)^n$. Then every partition λ appearing with nonzero coefficient in the expansion $G_I = \sum_{\lambda} \delta_{I,\lambda} G_{\lambda}$ is contained in R. Theorem 2.1 implies that we can encode the product $G_R \cdot G_I$ by applying $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ to the rational function

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} u_i^m \prod_{j=1}^{n} u_{n+j}^{I_j} \right) K_{n,n}(\boldsymbol{u}).$$

Using the process of Remark 2.5 we can obtain the comultiplication from this multiplication, and in the language of iterated residues, this corresponds to substituting $s_i = u_i$ for $1 \le i \le n$ and $t_j = u_{n+j}$ for $1 \le j \le n$ above and *dividing* the result by the monomial $s^R = \prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i^m$. The result is exactly the formula of Equation (10). $\square$

2.4. **Grothendieck polynomials and Schur functions.** We will conclude the section by proving a result relating the $\mathcal{G}$-operation to the $\mathcal{S}$-operation. This is motivated by the fact that since the single Grothendieck polynomial $G_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x})$ is symmetric in the variables $\boldsymbol{x}$, it has an expansion in the Schur basis. For the remainder of the section, we fix a positive integer M and let $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_M)$; that is, $x_i = 0$ for $i > M$.

For each integer $i \ge 0$, define symmetric functions $h_r^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x})$ via the generating function

$$\sum_{r \ge 0} h_r^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) u^r = \frac{(1-u)^i}{\prod_{j=1}^{M}(1 - x_j u)}. \tag{11}$$

The polynomials $h_r^{(i)}$ are non-homogeneous generalizations of the polynomials h_r. In particular notice that $h_r^{(0)} = h_r$. For any integer sequence $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_n)$ with $M \geq n$, define the determinant

$$g_I(\boldsymbol{x}) = (-1)^{M(M-1)/2} \det \left(h_{I_i+j-1}^{(i-1)}(\boldsymbol{x}) \right)_{1 \leq i,j \leq M} \tag{12}$$

where we agree that $I_r = 0$ for $r > n$. Notice that the size of the determinant depends on the number variables in the alphabet $\boldsymbol{x}$. This differs from the Jacobi-Trudi formula defining the (fake) Schur function s_I, cf. equation (3). Buch defined (11) and (12) [Buc02a, Section 3] to reformulate a result of Lenart as follows.

Proposition 2.7 ([Buc02a] Theorem 3.1, [Len00] Theorem 2.4)**.** *If λ is a partition and $M \geq \ell(\lambda)$ then we have*

$$G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) = g_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}). \qquad \square$$

In what follows it is convenient to define another iterated residue operation which encodes data regarding the complete homogeneous symmetric functions $h_k(\boldsymbol{x})$. In particular, for any integer sequence $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_p)$ we define

$$\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(t^I \right) = \prod_{i=1}^{p} h_{I_i}(\boldsymbol{x})$$

and extend the operation to rational functions just as for the $\mathcal{S}$- and $\mathcal{G}$- operations. The following lemma is a consequence of [Rim14] Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 2.8. *For any rational function $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}(f) = \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(f \cdot \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \left(1 - \frac{t_i}{t_j} \right) \right). \qquad \square$$

Theorem 2.9. *If λ is a partition then*

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}(t^\lambda) = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(t^\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{M} d_i^{i-1} \right).$$

Proof. Set $n = \ell(\lambda)$. If $M < n$ it is known that both sides are zero, say by using the tableaux descriptions of $G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $s_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x})$ as in [Buc02b, Mac95]. In the case $M \geq n$, an application of Lemma 2.8 means the result of the theorem is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(t^\lambda \right) = \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(t^\lambda \prod_{1 \leq i \leq M} (1 - t_i)^{i-1} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} \left(1 - \frac{t_i}{t_j} \right) \right). \tag{13}$$

We will prove the equality of (13). Begin by observing that

$$h_k^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{j=0}^{i} (-1)^j \binom{i}{j} h_{k-j}(\boldsymbol{x}),$$

which implies for any positive integer r that

$$h_k^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(t_r^k (1 - 1/t_r)^i \right) = \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(t_r^{k-i} (t_r - 1)^i \right).$$

From this we can write the determinant $g_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x})$ of equation (12) as the iterated residue expression

$$g_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}} \left(\det \left(t_i^{\lambda_i+j-i}(t_i-1)^{i-1} \right)_{1\leq i,j\leq M} \right) \tag{14}$$

where we recall the convention that $\lambda_r = 0$ for $r > n$. Proposition 2.7 implies that $G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) = g_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x})$, so (14) allows us to compute the left-hand side of (13) by applying $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}$ to the determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} t_1^{\lambda_1} & t_1^{\lambda_1+1} & \cdots & t_1^{\lambda_1+M-1} \\ t_2^{\lambda_2-1}(t_2-1) & t_2^{\lambda_2}(t_2-1) & \cdots & t_2^{\lambda_2+M-2}(t_2-1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_M^{\lambda_M-M+1}(t_M-1)^{M-1} & t_M^{\lambda_M-M+2}(t_M-1)^{M-1} & \cdots & t_M^{\lambda_M}(t_M-1)^{M-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

which can be rewritten as

$$t^\lambda \prod_{1\leq i\leq M} t_i^{-i+1}(t_i-1)^{i-1} \begin{vmatrix} 1 & t_1 & \cdots & t_1^{M-1} \\ 1 & t_2 & \cdots & t_2^{M-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & t_M & \cdots & t_M^{M-1} \end{vmatrix}.$$

The determinant above is the well-known *Vandermonde determinant* and is equal to $\prod_{1\leq i<j\leq M}(t_j - t_i)$. Hence, after switching the sign in each factor of $(t_i - 1)$ above, one obtains the expression

$$(-1)^{M(M-1)/2}\, t^\lambda \prod_{1\leq i\leq M} (1-t_i)^{i-1} \prod_{1\leq i\leq M} t_i^{-i+1} \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq M} (t_j - t_i)$$

and this is further equal to

$$(-1)^{M(M-1)/2}\, t^\lambda \prod_{1\leq i\leq m} (1-t_i)^{i-1} \prod_{1\leq i<j\leq m} \left(1 - \frac{t_i}{t_j}\right)$$

from which the desired equality follows. □

Remark 2.10. The result of Theorem 2.9 still holds even when λ is not a partition with an additional hypothesis regarding the size M of the alphabet $\boldsymbol{x}$. For more details see the thesis of the first author [All14b, Section 3]. However, we will not need the more general result in the sequel. ◊

Remark 2.11. Notice that for a Laurent series $f(\boldsymbol{t})$, the result of the operation $\mathcal{H}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}(f(\boldsymbol{t}))$ is equivalent to taking the constant term (in the $\boldsymbol{t}$ variables) of the formal series

$$f(\boldsymbol{t}) \prod_{t\in\boldsymbol{t}} \sum_{k\geq 0} \frac{h_k(\boldsymbol{x})}{t^k} = \frac{f(\boldsymbol{t})}{\prod_{t\in\boldsymbol{t}} \prod_{x\in\boldsymbol{x}} \left(1 - \frac{x}{t}\right)}.$$

Furthermore, taking the constant term of this series is equivalent to taking the successive residues at $t_1 = \infty$, $t_2 = \infty$, *et cetera*, of a series with shifted exponents. This observation is the reason for the name *iterated residue operation*. From one point of view, the results of Lemma 2.8 and Theorem 2.9 justify this terminology for the $\mathcal{S}$- and $\mathcal{G}$-operations, respectively. On the other hand, the $\mathcal{G}$-operation already shares an important connection with the residues at both infinity *and* zero via equation (1). ◊

3. The Pieri rule for Grothendieck polynomials

We devote this section to an application of the multiplication formula of Theorem 2.1. We give a new proof of the following theorem, a Pieri rule for the multiplication of stable Grothendieck polynomials.

Theorem 3.1 (Lenart [Len00], Theorem 3.4)**.** *For any partition λ and any positive integer n, the product $G_\lambda G_n$ has the form*

$$G_\lambda G_n = \sum_\nu c^\nu_{\lambda,n} G_\nu$$

where the sum is taken over all partitions ν with $|\nu| \geq |\lambda| + n$. The integer $c^\nu_{\lambda,n}$ is non-zero for only finitely many partitions ν and furthermore satisfies the positivity property

$$(-1)^{|\nu|-|\lambda|-n} c^\nu_{\lambda,n} \geq 0.$$

The statement is a special case of Equation (4) in which the partition μ happens to have length one. We begin by proving two lemmas which allow us to gather many terms in the expansion of Theorem 2.1 together for cancelation.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $a < b$ be positive integers and $f(\boldsymbol{t})$ be a rational function which does not depend on t_i and t_{i+1} and set*

$$\sigma = t_i^a t_{i+1}^b \sum_{j=0}^{b-a} \left(\frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}}\right)^j = t_i^a t_{i+1}^b + t_i^{a+1} t_{i+1}^{b-1} + \cdots + t_i^{b-1} t_{i+1}^{a+1} + t_i^b t_{i+1}^a.$$

Then $f \cdot \sigma \cdot d_i \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} f \cdot t_i^b t_{i+1}^a \cdot d_i$. Equivalently, if σ' denotes the sum

$$\sum_{j=0}^{b-a-1} t_i^{a+j} t_{i+1}^{b-j} = t_i^a t_{i+1}^b + t_i^{a+1} t_{i+1}^{b-1} + \cdots + t_i^{b-2} t_{i+1}^{a+2} + t_i^{b-1} t_{i+1}^{a+1},$$

then $f \cdot \sigma' \cdot d_i \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} 0$.

Proof. It suffices to consider the case when $f = 1$ and $i = 1$. The straightening Lemma 2.2 implies that $t_1^a t_2^b (1-t_1) \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} -t_1^{b-1} t_2^{a+1}(1-t_1)$, and hence the first and last terms in σ' cancel. One notes also that the second and second-to-last terms cancel since $t_1^{a+1} t_2^{b-1}(1-t_1) \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} -t_1^{b-2} t_2^{a+2}(1-t_1)$. Similarly the other terms cancel in pairs, except if σ' has an odd number of terms (occuring whenever $b-a$ is odd). In this case, the uncanceled term in the middle is necessarily of the form $t_1^{a+r} t_2^{a+r+1}(1-t_1)$ where $r = (b-a-1)/2$ and Lemma 2.2 implies this is $\mathcal{G}$-equivalent to zero. □

With f and σ as above, we will refer to an expression of the form $f \cdot \sigma \cdot d_i$ as a *canceling segment of type A*. In a slight abuse of language we will also call $f \cdot \sigma' \cdot d_i$ by the same name. On the other hand, an expression of the form $f \cdot \sigma \cdot d_i d_{i+1}$ will be called a *canceling segment of type B*. We justify the latter's title with the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $a \leq b$ be integers, and let f and σ be as in Lemma 3.2. One has*

$$f \cdot \sigma \cdot d_i \, d_{i+1} \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} f \cdot t_i^b t_{i+1}^a \cdot d_i.$$

Proof. As before, it is enough to consider $f = 1$ and $i = 1$. Then

$$\sigma d_1 d_2 = \sigma d_1 - t_2 \sigma d_1.$$

Applying Lemma 3.2 to both terms on the righthand side above and canceling appropriate terms yields the desired result. □

Throughout the remainder of the section, fix a partition λ and set $p = \ell(\lambda)$. Let $\mathcal{I}_n^p$ denote the following subset of finite integer sequences

$$\{I \in \mathbb{Z}^p \,:\, I_j \geq 0 \text{ for all } j \text{ and } |I| \leq n\}.$$

For each such integer sequence I, define a new integer sequence with $p+1$ parts $\lambda_I = \lambda + I, n - |I|$. Now define the products:

$$A_I^{\lambda,n} = \begin{cases} t^{\lambda_I} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{p} d_i & , \text{ when } |I| < n \\ t^{\lambda_I} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r-1} d_i & , \text{ when } |I| = n \text{ and } r = \ell(I) \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

Note that in the second case, the exponent on t_{p+1} is always zero. Moreover when $r = 1$, the product appearing in the second case $\prod_{i=1}^{0} d_i$ is understood to be empty, i.e. has value 1, and thus $A^{\lambda,n}_{(n,0,\ldots,0)}$ is just the monomial $t_1^n \cdot t^\lambda$.

For any $1 \leq j \leq p$, we say that $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ is $(j, j+1)$-*good* if it has the property that the j-th part of λ_I is at least the $(j+1)$-st part and, if d_{j+1} appears in the product, that the j-th part is strictly greater than the $(j+1)$-st part. Equivalently, the latter condition means that if $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ is $(j, j+1)$-good and $\lambda_j + I_j = \lambda_{j+1} + I_{j+1}$, then d_{j+1} must not be present. We say simply that $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ is *good* if it is $(j, j+1)$-good for all j in the range $1 \leq j \leq p$.

Example 3.4. For $\lambda = (4, 3, 1)$ and $n = 3$ we have

$$A^{(4,3,1),3}_{(1,2,0)} = t_1^5 t_2^5 t_3^1 d_1, \quad A^{(4,3,1),3}_{(1,0,1)} = t_1^5 t_2^3 t_3^2 t_4^1 d_1 d_2 d_3, \quad A^{(4,3,1),3}_{(0,1,1)} = t_1^4 t_2^4 t_3^2 t_4^1 d_1 d_2 d_3.$$

The first two examples are good. The last is both $(2, 3)$ and $(3, 4)$-good but not $(1, 2)$-good. The terminology comes from the fact that when a good $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ is expanded, the exponent in multi-index notation of each monomial is a partition. In this case applying the operation $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ evidently produces an expansion in Grothendieck polynomials which alternates in the weight of the corresponding partitions. For example

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(A^{(4,3,1),3}_{(1,2,0)}\right) = G_{5,5,1} - G_{6,5,1} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(A^{(4,3,1),3}_{(1,0,1)}\right) = G_{5,3,2,1} - (G_{6,3,2,1} + G_{5,4,2,1} + G_{5,3,3,1}) + (G_{6,4,2,1} + G_{6,3,3,1} + G_{5,4,3,1}) - G_{6,4,3,1}.$$

Note moreover that the lowest weight must necessarily be equal to $|\lambda| + n$, in this case $4 + 3 + 1 + 3 = 11 = 5 + 5 + 1 = 5 + 3 + 2 + 1$. ◊

Theorem 2.1 implies that

$$G_\lambda G_n = \mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(t^{\lambda,n} K_{p,1}(\boldsymbol{t})\right)$$

and so the following result reduces the problem of performing the multiplication $G_\lambda G_n$ to applying the $\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ operation to a *polynomial*. Observe that this proves

the finiteness assertion of Theorem 3.1; namely that the product is indeed a *finite* sum of stable Grothendieck polynomial corresponding to *partitions*, possibly after applying the straightening laws.

Proposition 3.5. *With λ, n, and $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ defined as above,*

$$t^{\lambda,n} K_{p,1}(\boldsymbol{t}) \overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_n^p} A_I^{\lambda,n}. \tag{16}$$

Proof. Recall that we expand the rational function $t^{\lambda,n} K_{p,1}(\boldsymbol{t})$ on the domain where t_{p+1} is much larger than the other variables. We begin by expanding the term $d_{1,p+1} = 1 - t_1 t_{p+1}^{-1}$ in the denominator of

$$\begin{aligned} t^{\lambda,n} K_{p,1}(\boldsymbol{t}) &= t^{\lambda,n} \frac{d_1 \cdot d_2 \cdots d_p}{d_{1,p+1} \cdot d_{2,p+1} \cdots d_{p,p+1}} \\ &= t^{\lambda,n} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(\frac{t_1}{t_{p+1}} \right)^k + \frac{t_1^n t_{p+1}^{-n}}{d_{1,p+1}} \right) \frac{d_1 \cdot d_2 \cdots d_p}{d_{2,p+1} \cdots d_{p,p+1}} \\ &= \left(t^{\lambda,n} + t_1 t^{\lambda,n-1} + \cdots + t_1^{n-1} t^{\lambda,1} \right) \frac{d_1 \cdot d_2 \cdots d_p}{d_{2,p+1} \cdots d_{p,p+1}} \\ &\quad + t_1^n t^{\lambda,0} \frac{d_1 \cdot d_2 \cdots d_p}{d_{1,p+1} \cdot d_{2,p+1} \cdots d_{p,p+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that in the final rational term t_{p+1} appears with only non-positive exponents. By Lemma 2.3 this term is $\mathcal{G}$-equivalent to the rational function obtained from the substitution $t_{p+1} = 1$, that is the polynomial $t_1^n t^\lambda$. This is the summand $A^{\lambda,n}_{(n,0,\ldots,0)}$.

On each remaining rational term we inductively reproduce the same technique, expanding the rest of the denominator factors $d_{i,p+1}$ in order of increasing i. Concluding with expanding the term $d_{p,p+1}$ in this way, the result is exactly the right-hand-side of Equation (16). □

Example 3.6. Let $\lambda = (2,1)$ and $n = 3$. The product $G_{2,1} G_3$ is given by

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}} \left(t_1^2 t_2^1 t_3^3 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_1/t_3)(1-t_2/t_3)} \right).$$

Expanding the denominator term $1 - t_1/t_3$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &t_1^2 t_2^1 t_3^3 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_2/t_3)} + t_1^3 t_2^1 t_3^2 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_2/t_3)} \\ &+ t_1^4 t_2^1 t_3^1 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_2/t_3)} + t_1^5 t_2^1 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_1/t_3)(1-t_2/t_3)} \end{aligned}$$

and after simplifying the last term by Lemma 2.3 this is $\mathcal{G}$-equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} t_1^2 t_2^1 t_3^3 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_2/t_3)} &+ t_1^3 t_2^1 t_3^2 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_2/t_3)} \\ &+ t_1^4 t_2^1 t_3^1 \frac{(1-t_1)(1-t_2)}{(1-t_2/t_3)} + t_1^5 t_2^1. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the denominator term $1 - t_2/t_3$ in each of the first, second, and third rational terms and applying Lemma 2.3 respectively yields the polynomials

$$t_1^2t_2^1t_3^3d_1d_2 + t_1^2t_2^2t_3^2d_1d_2 + t_1^2t_2^3t_3^1d_1d_2 + t_1^2t_2^4d_1,$$
$$t_1^3t_2^1t_3^2d_1d_2 + t_1^3t_2^2t_3^1d_1d_2 + t_1^3t_2^3d_1,$$
$$\text{and} \quad t_1^4t_2^1t_3^1d_1d_2 + t_1^4t_2^2d_1.$$

Where one identifies, for example, $A^{(2,1),3}_{(1,1)} = t_1^3t_2^2t_3^1d_1d_2$ and $A^{(2,1),3}_{(0,3)} = t_1^2t_2^4d_1$. $\Diamond$

It is useful to organize the sum on the right-hand-side of Equation (16) geometrically. Explicitly, consider the simplex Δ^p_n in $\mathbb{R}^p = \{(X_1, \ldots, X_p) : X_i \in \mathbb{R}\}$ defined by the equations

$$\sum_{i=j}^{p} X_j \leq n \quad \text{and} \quad X_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } i.$$

The $A^{\lambda,n}_I$ in the summation (16) are in bijection with the integer points in Δ^p_n, that is, the set $\mathcal{I}^p_n$. Observe that Δ^p_n depends on the integers $\ell(\lambda)$ and n, but not on λ itself.

The difficulty in proving that the signs alternate in Theorem 3.1 is in dealing with fake Grothendieck polynomials which appear in the expansion of Equation (16). We now provide an example of how the simplex described above is helpful in organization.

Example 3.7. As in Example 3.6, let $\lambda = (2, 1)$ and $n = 3$. We arrange the terms $A^{(2,1),3}_I$ for $I \in \mathcal{I}^2_3$ inside the triangle $\Delta^2_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ as follows:

$X_2 = 3$	$t_1^2t_2^4d_1$			
$X_2 = 2$	$t_1^2t_2^3t_3^1d_1d_2$	$t_1^3t_2^3d_1$		
$X_2 = 1$	$t_1^2t_2^2t_3^2d_1d_2$	$t_1^3t_2^2t_3^1d_1d_2$	$t_1^4t_2^2d_1$	
$X_2 = 0$	$t_1^2t_2^1t_3^3d_1d_2$	$t_1^3t_2^1t_3^2d_1d_2$	$t_1^4t_2^1t_3^1d_1d_2$	$t_1^5t_2^1$
	$X_1 = 0$	$X_1 = 1$	$X_1 = 2$	$X_1 = 3$

The picture above can be simplified in two major steps. The first constructs canceling segments beginning on the line $X_2 = 0$. The second constructs canceling segments beginning on the line $X_1 = 0$.

Consider points along the line $X_2 = 0$ (the bottom facet of Δ^2_3) and note that Lemma 3.2 implies that the $A^{(2,1),3}_I$ corresponding to the integer points $(0, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ cancel when added together, and moreover that $A^{(2,1),3}_{(1,0)}$ cancels itself. In other words, the sums through the points $\{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2)\}$ and $\{(1, 0), (1, 1)\}$ are both canceling segments of type A. This leaves only summands $A^{(2,1),3}_I$ which

are $(2,3)$-good and for which the exponent on t_3 never exceeds $\lambda_2 = 1$:

$X_2 = 3$	$t_1^2 t_2^4 d_1$			
$X_2 = 2$	$t_1^2 t_2^3 t_3^1 d_1 d_2$	$t_1^3 t_2^3 d_1$		
$X_2 = 1$		$t_1^3 t_2^2 t_3^1 d_1 d_2$	$t_1^4 t_2^2 d_1$	
$X_2 = 0$			$t_1^4 t_2^1 t_3^1 d_1 d_2$	$t_1^5 t_2^1$
	$X_1 = 0$	$X_1 = 1$	$X_1 = 2$	$X_1 = 3$

Now consider points on the left-hand facet $X_1 = 0$ which are not $(1,2)$-good. We can apply Lemma 3.2 to the canceling segment of type A through the points $\{(0,3),(1,2),(2,1)\}$ along the top diagonal. Doing so leaves the picture below:

$X_2 = 3$				
$X_2 = 2$	$t_1^2 t_2^3 t_3^1 d_1 d_2$			
$X_2 = 1$		$t_1^3 t_2^2 t_3^1 d_1 d_2$	$t_1^4 t_2^2 d_1$	
$X_2 = 0$			$t_1^4 t_2^1 t_3^1 d_1 d_2$	$t_1^5 t_2^1$
	$X_1 = 0$	$X_1 = 1$	$X_1 = 2$	$X_1 = 3$

Finally, we apply Lemma 3.3 along the next diagonal through the canceling segment of type B corresponding to points $\{(0,2),(1,1)\}$. We obtain the diagram:

$X_2 = 3$				
$X_2 = 2$				
$X_2 = 1$		$t_1^3 t_2^2 t_3^1 d_1$	$t_1^4 t_2^2 d_1$	
$X_2 = 0$			$t_1^4 t_2^1 t_3^1 d_1 d_2$	$t_1^5 t_2^1$
	$X_1 = 0$	$X_1 = 1$	$X_1 = 2$	$X_1 = 3$

In the picture above, we have deleted a d_2 from the $(1,1)$ box. However, we agree to leave the expression in the same location although it is no longer of the form $A^{(2,1),3}_{(1,1)}$.

Observe that the remaining summands are all good and so applying the conclusions of Example 3.4 and Proposition 3.5 implies that the signs in the product $G_{2,1}G_3$ alternate in the sense of Theorem 3.1. Moreover, when the terms above are expanded, the exponents on t_1 are never less than $n = 3$ but never exceed $\lambda_1 + n = 5$, those on t_2 never exceed $\lambda_1 = 2$, and those on t_3 never exceed $\lambda_2 = 1$. Explicitly, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} G_{2,1}G_3 &= G_{5,1} + (G_{4,1,1} - G_{5,1,1} - G_{4,2,1} + G_{5,2,1}) \\ &\quad + (G_{4,2} - G_{5,2}) + (G_{3,2,1} - G_{4,2,1}) \\ &= G_{5,1} + G_{4,1,1} + G_{4,2} + G_{3,2,1} \\ &\quad - (G_{5,1,1} + 2G_{4,2,1} + G_{5,2}) + G_{5,2,1} \end{aligned}$$

where in the former equality we have expanded each box from the final diagram within its own parentheses, and in the latter we have arranged the terms by weight, and therefore sign. Each partition which appears above has the property that its Young diagram contains that of the partitions $(2,1)$ and (3) but is contained in the Young diagram for $(2+3,2,1) = (5,2,1)$. $\Diamond$

We now show that the process in the previous example extends to an algorithm which applies to the general product $G_\lambda G_n$ for any partition λ and any positive integer n. Recall that for a partition λ of length p, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and an integer sequence $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_p)$ we define the sequence of length $p+1$ given by $\lambda_I = \lambda + I, n - |I|$.

Proof of alternating signs in Theorem 3.1. The proof will be by descending induction on the integer r which is allowed to range through $1 \leq r \leq p$. At each step we will cancel some summands $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ and ensure that those which remain are $(r, r+1)$-good.

Affix the $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ to the integer points $\mathcal{I}_n^p$ of the simplex Δ_n^p. We consider first the case $r = p$. Begin by locating terms which are not $(p, p+1)$-good in the $X_p = 0$ facet; in other words for which $n - |I| > \lambda_p + I_p$. We restrict to $X_p = 0$ since for fixed $I_1, \ldots, I_{p-1}$ the minimum value of the difference $(\lambda_p + I_p) - (n - |I|)$ occurs when $I_p = 0$. If this value is negative then begin a canceling segment of type A at the point $(I_1, \ldots, I_{p-1}, 0) \in \Delta_n^p$ moving in the direction of increasing X_p. Applying this analysis at each integer point in the hyperplane $X_p = 0$ leaves only $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ which are $(p, p+1)$-good and moreover, whose exponents on t_{p+1} are no more than λ_p.

Now suppose that r is in the range $1 \leq r \leq p-1$ and make the following inductive assumptions. Each $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ remaining uncanceled from previous steps has the properties:

(I) it is $(j, j+1)$-good for every $j > r$, and
(II) the $(r+2)$-nd part of λ_I lies in the range $[\lambda_{r+2}, \lambda_{r+1}]$.

Notice that the analysis of the preceding paragraph ensures the inductive assumptions are met for the value $r = p-1$. The conditions above allow for the possibility that the $(r+1)$-st part is larger than the r-th part in λ_I, and these are precisely the terms we wish to target.

Explicitly, in the facet $X_r = 0$ locate points for which $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ is not $(r, r+1)$-good. For such points, begin a canceling segment in the direction $\epsilon_r - \epsilon_{r+1}$ where $\{\epsilon_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ denotes the set of standard basis vectors for $\mathbb{R}^p$. In other words, begin a canceling segment with $a = \lambda_r$ and $b = \lambda_{r+1} + I_{r+1}$ in the statements of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3. We first restrict to $X_r = 0$ since for fixed values of I_j with $j \neq r, r+1$, the $A_I^{\lambda,n}$ with the largest difference $(\lambda_{r+1} + I_{r+1}) - (\lambda_r + I_r)$ must lie on this facet. If the initial point $(I_1, \ldots, I_{r-1}, 0, I_{r+1}, I_{r+2}, \ldots, I_p)$ additionally lies in the subspace

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{p} X_i = n \right\} \cap \{X_j = 0 \text{ for all } j > r+1\},$$

then this forms a canceling segment of type A. Otherwise, it forms a canceling segment of type B.

We now do the type B case explicitly; the type A case is similar. In order to apply the process of the preceding paragraph one must have that $\lambda_r \leq \lambda_{r+1} + I_{r+1}$. Set $\delta = I_{r+1} - (\lambda_r - \lambda_{r+1})$ to be the difference, where $0 \leq \delta \leq I_{r+1}$ by assumption; the upper bound is given by the fact that λ is a partition. As in Lemma 3.3, set $a = \lambda_r = \lambda_{r+1} + I_{r+1} - \delta$ and $b = \lambda_{r+1} + I_{r+1} = \lambda_r + \delta$. Finally set

$$f = \left(\prod_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq p \\ j \neq r, r+1}} t_j^{\lambda_j + I_j} \right) \left(t_{p+1}^{n-|I|} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq s \\ i \neq r, r+1}} d_i \right)$$

for some $s > r$ determined by Equation (15). Then we are to consider the sum

$$f \left(t_r^a t_{r+1}^b + t_r^{a+1} t_{r+1}^{b-1} + \cdots + t_r^{b-1} t_{r+1}^{a+1} + t_r^b t_{r+1}^a \right) d_r d_{r+1} \tag{17a}$$

$$\overset{\mathcal{G}}{\sim} f \cdot t_r^b t_{r+1}^a \cdot d_r = f \cdot t_r^{\lambda_r + \delta} t_{r+1}^{\lambda_{r+1} + I_{r+1} - \delta} \cdot d_r = f \cdot t_r^{\lambda_r + \delta} t_{r+1}^{\lambda_r} \cdot d_r. \tag{17b}$$

In the type A case δ is strictly positive and the term d_{r+1} is never present. We agree that the polynomial remaining on the right-hand-side of (17b) is identified still to the point

$$I' = (I_1, \ldots, I_{r-1}, \delta, I_{r+1} - \delta, I_{r+2}, \ldots, I_p) \in \Delta_n^p$$

even though the original factor of d_{r+1} in $A_{I'}^{\lambda,n}$ has disappeared. Each term in the canceling segment must exist since for each summand $A_J^{\lambda,n}$ which appears in (17a), the total $|J|$ is fixed. Moreover, conditions (I) and (II) ensure that no term in the canceling segment (17a) could have appeared and been cancelled by a segment formed for a larger r value.

Equation (17b) guarantees, since $b \geq a$ or $\delta \geq 0$, that the remaining polynomial is now $(r, r+1)$-good and thus satisfies the inductive assumption (I). Furthermore, since the exponent on t_{r+1} in (17b) must be λ_r it evidently lies in the range $[\lambda_{r+1}, \lambda_r]$ and we have satisfied the inductive assumption (II). If any term in the $X_r = 0$ hyperplane was already $(r, r+1)$-good, then its exponent $e_{r+1} = \lambda_{r+1} + I_{r+1}$ on t_{r+1} must have satisfied $\lambda_{r+1} \leq e_{r+1} \leq \lambda_r$. This ensures that all remaining summands identified to integer points of Δ_n^p will satisfy (I) and (II) for r less one.

By decreasing induction on r we are left only with good summands and, using the observation of Example 3.4 that good polynomials produce the desired alternation in signs, this algorithm proves Theorem 3.1. □

4. Schur expansions of single Grothendieck polynomials

We now restate another theorem of Lenart and devote this section to proving it with iterated residue techniques.

Theorem 4.1 (Lenart [Len00], Theorem 2.8)**.** *For any partition λ and family of variables $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_M)$ with $M \geq \ell(\lambda)$, one has*

$$G_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{\lambda \subseteq \mu \subseteq \hat{\lambda}} (-1)^{|\mu| - |\lambda|} a_{\lambda\mu} s_\mu(\boldsymbol{x}) \tag{18}$$

where the sum is taken over partitions μ and each coefficient $a_{\lambda\mu}$ is non-negative. The partition $\hat{\lambda}$ denotes the unique maximal partition of length M obtained by adding at most $j-1$ boxes to the j-th row of the Young diagram of λ.

We remark that if $M < \ell(\lambda)$ then both sides above are zero. We now prove two lemmas which play a role analogous to that of Lemma 2.2 but for the $\mathcal{S}$ operation.

Lemma 4.2. *If $f(\boldsymbol{t})$ is a polynomial symmetric in t_i and t_{i+1}, then*

$$t_i^p t_{i+1}^q f(\boldsymbol{t}) \overset{\mathcal{S}}{\sim} -t_i^{q-1} t_{i+1}^{p+1} f(\boldsymbol{t})$$

Proof. We give the proof in the case that f depends only on t_1 and t_2; the general case is identical. Moreover, since the monomial symmetric functions form a basis for the ring of symmetric functions, we reduce to the case that $f(t_1, t_2) = m_{a,b}(t_1, t_2) = t_1^a t_2^b + t_1^b t_2^a$. Then for any integers p and q we have

$$t_1^p t_2^q \left(t_1^a t_2^b + t_1^b t_2^a\right) = t_1^{b+p} t_2^{a+q} + t_1^{a+p} t_2^{b+q}.$$

The relation of (5a) implies that the polynomial above is $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$-equivalent to the polynomial

$$-t_1^{a+q-1} t_2^{b+p+1} - t_1^{b+q-1} t_2^{a+p+1} = -t_1^{q-1} t_2^{p+1} \left(t_1^a t_2^b + t_1^b t_2^a\right). \qquad \square$$

Remark 4.3. Lemma 4.2 implies that inside the $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ operation, one can perform the standard algorithm for expressing a fake Schur polynomial s_I as $\pm s_\nu$ for a partition ν, i.e. Equation (5a) on any monomial multiplied by a factor which is symmetric in the appropriate variables. $\Diamond$

One consequence of Lemma 4.2 is the following vanishing lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *For f as in Lemma 4.2,*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}\left(t_{i+1}f(\boldsymbol{t})\right) = 0.$$

Proof. The result follows from Lemma 4.2 and Remark 4.3 since $s_{r,r+1} = 0$ for any integer r by equation (5b). In particular, $s_{0,1} = 0$. $\square$

Now for every finite integer sequence $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_M)$ define the new sequences $\epsilon_k^{\pm}(I) = I \pm \epsilon_k$ where as in Section 3 we let $\{\epsilon_i\}_{1\leq i\leq M}$ denote the set of standard basis vectors. In words, either add or subtract 1 to the k-th part of I and leave the rest of the sequence unchanged.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $M \geq p$. Let λ be a partition with $\ell(\lambda) = p$ and $I = (I_1, \ldots, I_M)$ be a weakly increasing integer sequence such that $I_k - I_{k-1} = 1$ for some k. Observe that $\epsilon_k^-(I)$ is also a weakly increasing sequence.*

(i) If $\lambda_{k-1} = \lambda_k$, then

$$t^\lambda d^I \overset{\mathcal{S}}{\sim} t^\lambda d^{\epsilon_k^-(I)}.$$

(ii) If $\lambda_{k-1} \gneqq \lambda_k$ then $\epsilon_k^+(\lambda)$ remains a partition and moreover,

$$t^\lambda d^I \overset{\mathcal{S}}{\sim} t^\lambda d^{\epsilon_k^-(I)} - t^{\epsilon_k^+(\lambda)} d^{\epsilon_k^-(I)}.$$

Proof. For notational simplicity we provide the proof only for the case that $M = k = 2$; the general proof is completely analogous. Write $I = (p, p{+}1)$ and $\lambda = (a, b)$. Thus $\epsilon_2^-(I) = (p, p)$ and $\epsilon_2^+(\lambda) = (a, b{+}1)$. Consider the high-school algebra identity

$$\begin{aligned} t_1^a t_2^b (1-t_1)^p (1-t_2)^{p+1} &= t_1^a t_2^b (1-t_2)(1-t_1)^p (1-t_2)^p \\ &= t_1^a t_2^b (1-t_1)^p (1-t_2)^p - t_1^a t_2^{b+1} (1-t_1)^p (1-t_2)^p. \end{aligned}$$

We now wish to apply the operation $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}$ to both sides above. In the case that $a = b$, the second term of the last line above vanishes by Lemma 4.4. In the case $a > b$, this term remains. $\square$

We are now ready to establish that the Schur expansion of a stable Grothendieck polynomial alternates as desired. Recall that for a partition λ of length p, $M \geq p$, $I = (0, 1, 2, \ldots, M-1)$, and $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_M)$, Theorem 2.9 asserts that

$$\mathcal{G}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}\left(t^\lambda\right) = \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}\left(t^\lambda d^I\right). \tag{19}$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. First observe that the polynomial inside the $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}$-operation of (19) satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 4.5, explicitly with the weakly increasing sequence $I = (0, 1, 2, \ldots, M-1)$. For each integer $2 \leq j \leq M$ define k_j to be the sequence $(j, j+1, \ldots, M)$ and form the concatenated sequence

$$\boldsymbol{k} = k_M k_{M-1} k_{M-2} \ldots k_2.$$

If one chooses the value of k in the order prescribed by $\boldsymbol{k}$ (reading left to right) the resulting exponents appearing on the factors $\prod_i d_i^{e_i}$ for every term will also satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 4.5—in particular no adjacent exponents will ever differ by more than one. By induction on the weight of I, this proves the theorem

since negative signs are introduced in Lemma 4.5 if and only if the weight of $|\lambda|$ is increased by exactly 1.

The fact that every partition μ appearing on the right-hand side of Equation (18) is contained in the interval $\lambda \subseteq \mu \subseteq \hat{\lambda}$ follows from the fact that each monomial remaining at the end of the induction must correspond to a partition, and no integer $2 \leq j \leq M$ appears more than $j-1$ times in the sequence $\boldsymbol{k}$. □

Example 4.6. Consider the partition $\lambda = (2)$ and $M = 3$ so that $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$. Then the Schur expansion of $G_2(\boldsymbol{x})$ can be computed by forming the sequence $\boldsymbol{k} = (3, 2, 3)$ and transforming $t_1^2(1-t_2)(1-t_3)^2$ by Lemma 4.5 according to the steps:

$$\begin{aligned} k = 3 &\rightsquigarrow t_1^2(1-t_2)(1-t_3) \\ k = 2 &\rightsquigarrow \left(t_1^2 - t_1^2 t_2\right)(1-t_3) \\ k = 3 &\rightsquigarrow (t_1^2) - (t_1^2 t_2 - t_1^2 t_2 t_3). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that each monomial above corresponds to a Schur function $s_\lambda(\boldsymbol{x})$ for a *partition* λ once we apply the operation $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{t}}^{\boldsymbol{x}}$. Moreover, notice that there is no cancellation among the particular monomials which have appeared. In the end, we conclude that

$$G_2(\boldsymbol{x}) = s_2(\boldsymbol{x}) - s_{21}(\boldsymbol{x}) + s_{211}(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

Finally, observe that $(2,1,1)$ is indeed the partition $\hat{\lambda}$ corresponding to $\lambda = (2)$ and $M = 3$. ◊

References

[All14a] J. Allman, *Grothendieck classes of quiver cycles as iterated residues*, Michigan Math. J. **63** (2014), no. 4, 865–888. MR 3286674

[All14b] ———, *K-classes of quiver cycles, Grothendieck polynomials, and iterated residues*, Ph.D. thesis, UNC–Chapel Hill, 2014.

[Bri02] M. Brion, *Positivity in the Grothendieck group of complex flag varieties*, J. Algebra **258** (2002), no. 1, 137–159, Special issue in celebration of Claudio Procesi's 60th birthday. MR 1958901 (2003m:14017)

[Bri05] ———, *Lectures on the geometry of flag varieties*, Topics in cohomological studies of algebraic varieties, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2005, pp. 33–85. MR 2143072 (2006f:14058)

[BS12] G. Bérczi and A. Szenes, *Thom polynomials of Morin singularities*, Ann. of Math. **175** (2012), no. 2, 567–629. MR 2877067

[Buc02a] A.S. Buch, *Grothendieck classes of quiver varieties*, Duke Math. J. **115** (2002), no. 1, 75–103. MR 1932326

[Buc02b] ———, *A Littlewood-Richardson rule for the K-theory of Grassmannians*, Acta Math. **189** (2002), no. 1, 37–78. MR 1946917

[Buc05] ———, *Combinatorial K-theory*, Topics in cohomological studies of algebraic varieties, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2005, pp. 87–103. MR 2143073

[Buc08] ———, *Quiver coefficients of Dynkin type*, Michigan Math. J. **57** (2008), 93–120, Special volume in honor of Melvin Hochster. MR 2492443

[FG98] S. Fomin and C. Greene, *Noncommutative Schur functions and their applications*, Discrete Mathematics **193** (1998), 179–200.

[FK94] S. Fomin and A.N. Kirillov, *Grothendieck polynomials and the Yang-Baxter equation*, Proc. 6th Intern. Conf. on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics, DIMACS, 1994, pp. 183–189. MR 2307216

[FK96] ———, *The Yang-Baxter equation, symmetric functions, and Schubert polynomials*, Discrete Math. **153** (1996), 123–143. MR 1394950 (98b:05101)

[FL94] W. Fulton and A. Lascoux, *A Pieri formula in the Grothendieck ring of a flag bundle*, Duke Math. J. **76** (1994), no. 3, 711–729. MR 1309327 (96j:14036)

[Kal13] R. Kaliszewski, *Structure of quiver polynomials and Schur positivity*, Ph.D. thesis, UNC–Chapel Hill, 2013.

[Kaz10a] M. É. Kazarian, *Gysin homomorphism and degeneracies*, unpublished, 2010.

[Kaz10b] ———, *Non-associative Hilbert scheme and Thom polynomials*, unpublished, 2010.

[Len00] C. Lenart, *Combinatorial aspects of the K-theory of Grassmannians*, Ann. Comb. **4** (2000), no. 1, 67–82. MR 1763950

[LS82] A. Lascoux and M.P. Schützenberger, *Structure de Hopf de l'anneau de cohomologie et de l'anneau de Grothendieck d'une variété de drapeaux (French. English summary)*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **295** (1982), no. 11, 629–633. MR 0686357

[Mac95] I.G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995.

[Mil05] E. Miller, *Alternating formulas for K-theoretic quiver polynomials*, Duke Math. J. **128** (2005), no. 1, 1–17. MR 2137947

[Rim14] R. Rimányi, *Quiver polynomials in iterated residue form*, J. Algebraic Combin. **40** (2014), no. 2, 527–542. MR 3239295

[RS15] R. Rimányi and A. Szenes, *K-theoretic Thom polynomials and their expansions in Grothendieck polynomials*, in preparation, 2015.

[Zie14] M. Zielenkiewicz, *Integration over homogeneous spaces for classical Lie groups using iterated residues at infinity*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. **12** (2014), no. 4, 574–583. MR 3152171

Department of Mathematics, Wake Forest University, P.O. Box 7388, 127 Manchester Hall, Winston–Salem, NC 27109

E-mail address: allmanjm@wfu.edu

Department of Mathematics, UNC–Chapel Hill, Phillips Hall CB#3250, Chapel Hill, NC 27599–3250

E-mail address: rimanyi@email.unc.edu